

### Remarks


Claims 40 and 45 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 54 of U.S. Patent No. 6,719,159 and claims 1 – 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,142,325.

As the Examiner clarified in a voice message on October 23, 2007, there is no other outstanding rejection in spite of the statements on the cover page of the Office Action.

A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith, thereby obviating the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 40 and 45.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that this application be passed to allowance. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles N.J. Ruggiero  
Reg. No. 28,468  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401

October 24, 2007